

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

KEITH PAUL BIRD,

**Plaintiff(s),**

V.

JULIE WILLIAMS, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:24-cv-00120-JAD-NJK

## ORDER

[Docket No. 53]

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to compel discovery. Docket No. 53.<sup>1</sup>

13 Defendants filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 62. No reply was filed. The motion is  
14 properly resolved without a hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-1.

15 Plaintiff's motion indicates that responses to the disputed discovery were untimely and  
16 asks the Court to "review in camera" the subject documents to make a ruling on various objections.  
17 Docket No. 53 at 3; *see also id.* at 4-5. Plaintiff also seeks, without elaboration, other discovery-  
18 related relief. *Id.* at 3. By his own admission, Plaintiff then "[d]igresses" into rehashing the  
19 allegations in the pleadings and lamenting as to accusations of bad behavior. *See id.* at 4. The  
20 motion does not provide meaningful argument on any of the discovery disputes at issue.

21 Plaintiff's motion misunderstands the Court's role in addressing discovery disputes.  
22 Discovery is meant to proceed with limited involvement of the Court. *Cardoza v. Bloomin'*  
23 *Brands*, 141 F. Supp. 3d 1137, 1145 (D. Nev. 2015). Parties are not permitted to file a motion to  
24 compel indicating simply that there are disagreements on discovery and that the Court should  
25 resolve them; a discovery motion must provide actual argument as to each of those disagreements.  
26 *E.g., Lux v. Buchanan*, 2024 WL 1598805, at \*1 (D. Nev. Apr. 12, 2024). Moreover, asking the

<sup>1</sup> The Court liberally construes the filings of *pro se* litigants, particularly those who are prisoners bringing civil rights claims. *Blaisdell v. Frappiea*, 729 F.3d 1237, 1241 (9th Cir. 2013).

1 Court to conduct an *in camera* review does not allow a party to bypass the basic requirements for  
2 motion practice. *E.g., Garcia v. Serv. Emps. Int'l Union*, 2018 WL 6566563, at \*5 (D. Nev. Sept.  
3 6, 2018) (“*In camera* review of documents is disfavored and does not replace the standard  
4 adversarial process”).

5 In short, the pending motion to compel does not sufficiently address the issues in dispute.

6 Accordingly, the motion to compel is **DENIED** without prejudice.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: April 7, 2025

9   
10 Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28